

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 319

HE 008 690

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE The Opening of Admissions: The Case of the State University of Agape System.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 27p.; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Principles; Administrative Problems; Boards of Education; *College Admission; Colleges; Community Colleges; *Computer Oriented Programs; Educational Supply; *Higher Education; *Information Networks; Institutional Administration; Race Relations; School Registration; Student Application; *Systems Development; Universities
IDENTIFIERS Autonomy

ABSTRACT

The system of higher education in Agape (a fictitious name for a real place) is the result of a board of regents decision to consolidate eight campuses (two four-year and six community colleges) and to develop a coordinated program that would simplify admissions and make higher education available to all of its citizens. At the time of consolidation into a single system, a unique, computer-assisted, admissions planning, counseling, and processing was established. A set of 13 philosophical and administrative guidelines was used in developing the system. Special problems arose in the process of implementing it: autonomy, racial issues, and lack of experience were significant among them.
(Author/MSE)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED1355319

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Opening of Admissions: The Case of the
State University of Agape System

Robert A. Scott
Cornell University

HE 00 8690

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Opening of Admissions: The Case of
the State University of Agape System*

The numerous discussions about open admissions and the overcoming of enrollment barriers set forth a conceptual framework that requires testing. We know that barriers exist; how are they being overcome? How do individual institutions react to the barriers? Why do they respond to them at all? To help answer these and related questions, one must look intensively at an institution or a system in terms of the barriers.

There have been many articles about the Open Admissions Program at the City University of New York and the policies of open-door community colleges, but few examinations of how other institutions have worked to overcome the academic, financial, geographic, and motivation barriers to enrollment.

The Agape system is the result of a State Board of Regents decision to bring eight separate campuses together into a single system and to develop a coordinated program that would simplify admissions procedures and make higher education available to all of its citizens.

This case study about the Agape system includes a brief institutional history; an examination of the organization and its philosophy of admissions and pattern of decision-making; and special considerations such as size, complexity, and location.

* All names connected with Agape in this study have been disguised, but they represent real people and institutions. This case is adapted from Opened Admissions: Its Past and Its Promise; An Examination of the Trend Toward Universal Opportunity for Post-Secondary Schooling in the United States, with Cases. Cornell University, 1976. The research for this report was supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation.

The State of Agape University System

The University of Agape started* as the College of Agape in 1907 with five students and twelve faculty members on a temporary campus in the downtown section of a major city. A federal landgrant institution, it specialized in agriculture and the mechanic arts. In 1912 the campus moved to the Flora valley where nearly one hundred acres had been reserved for college buildings. The institution became known as the University of Agape with the addition of a college of arts and sciences in 1920.

During the next twenty years the University began to develop a special interest in serving as a bridge between the East and the West. Physical and academic expansion followed World War II, and opportunities for growth and new responsibilities were presented to the University when Agape became a state.

In 1964 the University was authorized to operate a state-wide community college system. With four state-owned technical schools as a base, the system developed and opened a fifth campus in 1968 at Ward, and a sixth in 1969 at Tope, on the island of Agape. The community colleges each offer a variety of college transfer, general education, and career programs. They award certificates and associate degrees.

The faculties of the community colleges reflect in their training the curricular divisions of labor that have been achieved in the system. Each campus offers both a general program and some specialized areas of study. For example, Food Service, Heavy Equipment, Maintenance and Repair, and Management courses

* For this brief history I have relied on the University of Agape Bulletin for details.

are offered at some campuses, while Travel Industry Management and Sheet Metal Technology are offered at others. However, Secretarial Science, Police Science, and Liberal Arts are offered at almost all campuses. Most faculty in academic areas have Bachelor's or Master's degrees (primarily from Hawaii or other Western states), while instructors in vocational areas have special certificates.¹

The largest campus in the state, the University of Agape at Flora, is a complex university with a variety of academic divisions: Arts and Sciences, Business Administration (including the School of Travel Industry Management), Continuing Education and Community Service, Education, Engineering, Health Services and Social Welfare (including the Schools of Medicine, Nursing, Public Health, and Social Work), and Tropical Agriculture (including the Cooperative Extension Service and the Agape Agriculture Experiment Station). Experimental undergraduate programs such as New College, Ethnic Studies, Liberal Studies, and others are open to all students. The Law School, the School of Library Studies, and the Graduate Division are also located on this campus. The faculty at Flora is a university faculty; a large proportion have doctorates or equivalent professional degrees and engage in outside-sponsored research through their departments and the numerous research centers on campus.²

¹ Compiled from community college catalogs.

² Compiled from the University of Agape Bulletin.

A second four-year institution, the small liberal arts college at Tope, is in its sixth year. Its teaching faculty of 85, 54 of whom hold earned doctorates, offer courses in traditional liberal arts areas, with Anthropology, Art, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, Education, English, History, Languages, Mathematics, and Physics the largest departments.³

A similar college is planned for Ward. In Prospectus for the Seventies (January, 1970), the president of the University stated that:

There are sound reasons for accommodating many more of them (students) at smaller four-year campuses, where higher residential ratios, easier achievement of close faculty-student relations, and more new purpose-oriented and interdisciplinary programs may moderate the high costs, student anomie and complaints about "relevance" which are so characteristic of large university campuses throughout the United States.

In the fall of 1969, one out of every twenty-four people in Agape was a student in the University system. Of these 35,000 students, 27,500 were enrolled for full-time academic credit. The others were enrolled in non-credit and apprentice programs. Since 1959, the enrollment of full-time students has grown by more than 400%, from 7680 to 35,000.⁴

The overwhelming percentage of students in the system are from Agape, since the State mandates that no more than 10% of students at Community Colleges and Tope, or 16-17% of students at Flora, may be from out-of-state.⁵ Nevertheless, the students

³ Compiled from the University of Agape at Tope Catalog.

⁴ Prospectus for the Seventies. Board of Regents.

⁵ "Enrollment Projections - University of Agape System." Office of Analytical Studies, June 3, 1971.

are a diverse lot of Native Agapians, Samoans, Caucasians, and Japanese- and Chinese-Americans from both urban and rural backgrounds, and the U.S. military. A large number of recent immigrants are from Asian countries. At some campuses, a large percentage of students are enrolled part-time and are older (26 years old or more) than typical college students.⁶

In Controlled Growth For the University of Agape;

Statement by the Board of Regents, September 21, 1970, page 3,
we read the following:

The University of Agape has grown dramatically over the past ten years. During the period from 1959 to 1969, day credit enrollment increased from 7173 to 28,097, over 292%; faculty and staff went up from 1103 to 4128, or 274%; and operating expenditures grew from \$12.0 million to \$84.8 million, or 606%. Ten years ago the Flora campus offered 49 undergraduate majors, 33 master's programs, and 7 doctorates. The comparable figures today are 65 undergraduate majors, 70 master's programs, and 31 doctoral degrees. More than 60 occupational specialties have been added through the development of six community colleges. Advanced research activities and community service programs have expanded enormously in quality, scope, diversity, geography, and cost.

This growth has not only been wholeheartedly supported by the people of Agape; it was in a sense mandated by them....Per capita support for the University has increased more than four and one-half times for the past ten years.⁷

Table I⁸

Fiscal Year	Per Cent Growth of General Fund Revenues	Per Cent Growth of U.A. Appropriations	U.A. Appropriations as Percentage of State Revenues
1968-69	17.6%	13.4%	12.4%
1969-70	17.4%	23.5%	13.2%
1970-71	10.4%	29.7%	15.5%

⁶"Selected Characteristics of Students, Community Colleges," Spring 1973, CC-IRP 48, March 1973, p. 3.

⁷ Controlled Growth, p. 6.

⁸ Ibid.

The extraordinary level of per capita support for higher education may be underscored by reviewing selected data presented by The Chronicle of Higher Education, Volume V, Number 3, October 12, 1970, page 1.

Table II
Per Capita Support of Higher Education
(Selected States)⁹

State	Appropriations Per Capita	Rank Per Capita	Two-Year Gain
Agape	\$73.70	1	78%
Alaska	57.70	2	63.5
New York	41.52	13	54.5
California	41.49	14	28
Louisiana	34.18	25	23
Massachusetts	20.62	49	68
New Hampshire	15.13	50	7

The average two-year gain was 38.5%

I have noted that enrollment grew, too. In 1966, the college of the still unborn system enrolled nearly 17,850 students. Of these, 14,775 were on the Flora campus, 570 were in Tope, and 2,505 were in the five community colleges, which are located on four of the five major counties in the state. By 1969, enrollment had increased as shown in the following table. Projected enrollments are even more startling.

⁹ The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Table III
University of Agape System Fall Semester
Credit Enrollment* Actual 1966-69,
Projected 1973-76 (Normal Growth Assumptions)¹⁰

	Flora Campus (Daytime Credit)	Tope Campus	Five Community Colleges†	Total System
Actual				
1966	14,772	571	2505	17,848
1969	18,474	864	8,197	27,535
Projected¹				
1973	24,605	1418	12,567	38,590
1976	29,670	1638	15,875	47,183

The projected figures were extrapolated from normal growth assumptions. However, these assumptions were revised in 1969 and 1970 when it was decided 1) that the Flora campus should restrict its growth and maintain a stable enrollment of about 23,000; and 2) that students should be diverted to other campuses in the system. The following table shows the revised projections.

Actual 1974: ¹¹	21,526	1, 860	15,116	41,079 **
----------------------------	--------	--------	--------	-----------

* Note that these totals exclude non-credit enrollment (896 in 1969). For the Flora campus, they also exclude credit enrollment in evening courses (3,114 in 1969) and enrollment in the University of Agape Summer Session (20,410 in 1969).

† Figures do not include Agape Technical School, which is becoming the sixth community college, and projections do not take account of a seventh community college to be developed.

**This total includes all units in operation.

¹⁰ Prospectus, p. 10.

¹¹ Systems Admissions Coordinator Report. "Registrations in Regular Credit and Other Programs. University of Agape System, Fall 1974."

Table IV
University of Agape System Fall Semester
Credit Enrollment Actual 1969
Projected 1973 and 1976 (Revised Assumptions)¹²

Year	Flora Campus	New Campus	Tope Campus	Seven Community Colleges	Total System
1969	18,474		864	8,584	27,922
1973'	24,000	1,000	1,500	14,000	40,500
1976	23,000	3,500	2,500	21,000	50,000
' Actual 1974: ¹³	26,802	0	1,860	17,693	47,214

For many years, the state of Agape has offered and encouraged opportunities in higher education. However, until 1971 the various campuses were relatively autonomous units, and it seems that coordinated state-wide planning of post-secondary education was rare. In 1971, a system of universal higher education was mandated. It was to encompass all public higher education units in the state and was designed to limit the enrollment at Flora and to provide options to fit the individual needs of all the people in Agape.

Prospectus in the Seventies says, "To limit Flora in this way (i.e. to 23,000 students) will require a number of coordinated moves: a more rapid build-up (of the small four-year college) at Tope, a faster development of the new (four-year) campus than the present plans contemplate, maintenance of a steep

¹² Prospectus, p. 11.

¹³ "Registrations in Regular Credit and Other Programs, University of Agape System, Fall 1974."

slope for the community colleges' expansion curve, and a well-managed system-wide program of admission to and transfers within the state-wide University system as a whole."¹⁴

Controlled growth and the development of a system of higher education that provided extensive and coordinated curricular opportunities needed one another. One could not control the growth of the Flora campus and promise further education and training to all without having additional campuses to accommodate the students. However, the campuses available were the community colleges that had their own autonomous system. A new umbrella was needed to cover all campuses and to make dispersion possible throughout the state. New campuses would also be required.

In 1970, the University Board of Regents decided that for "open admissions" to be realized, a coordinated system of higher education had to be planned. Their major policy statement asked "the University administration to establish as soon as possible centralized admission policies and procedures, in order to facilitate the University's efforts to offer higher education to as many of Agape's citizens as possible, and to effect an optimum distribution of Mainland and foreign students among the University's campuses."¹⁵ The phrase "centralized admissions policies and procedures" is of major significance. These five words carried the seed of

¹⁴ Prospectus.

¹⁵ Controlled Growth for the University of Agape: Community Colleges. Policy Statements by the Board of Regents of the University of Agape, Fall 1970.

coordination and coherence; a simplified admissions process; expanded college guidance, planning, and data management; the dispersion of students among the campuses; and a single application form with up to four choices of campuses and curricula. With this phrase in the Regent's directive, a new era in admissions was born. The University administration responded to the Regents' charge by appointing a committee and hiring this writer as a consultant to study the existing organization and propose a new structure.

The development of a true system of higher education meant that individual campuses could no longer make their admissions decisions without regard to their obligations to the citizens of the state and to the remainder of the system. In the past, each campus had acted as an autonomous unit in admissions procedures no less than in other ways. The development of a system, i.e. the desire to have a system and to limit enrollment at Flora, meant that admissions had to be coordinated throughout the state. To accomplish this, changes in procedures were needed, and information about the system, its procedures and opportunities, was needed by the campuses, the high schools, and the applicants. The first step was to develop a single application form that could be used by students applying to any campus. The second step was the articulation of the curricula at two-year and four-year campuses so that the opportunity for an individual to progress through the system of higher education would be more than mere catalogue rhetoric.

At the time of the decision to develop a coordinated system, the two four-year colleges and the six community colleges comprising public higher education in Agape used four different application forms. U.S. and foreign applicants to the College at Tope and the units at Flora used one of three six-page forms, one for U.S. applicants to Tope, one for U.S. applicants to Flora, and one for foreign student applicants. Community college applicants used a different multiple-part form. The flow of paper was enormous; several different application forms were in use; certification of state residency required forms in triplicate; and students usually applied to several campuses, with the result that one applicant could generate several dozen pieces of paper that had to be processed by secondary schools and colleges.

All applicants followed the same basic procedures: they each completed one application for each campus to which they planned to apply, and then sent the application either directly to the appropriate campus or first to their secondary school. The latter did its part and sent the forms to the proper campus.

After the campuses chose the candidates to whom they would offer admission, the admissions officers sent one copy of the data collection page of the application form either to the Community College System Office or to the Management Systems Office at Flora. The community colleges sent this data for all applicants; the four-year colleges sent data only for those offered admission. This operation was more of a registration

system than an admissions system: it produced few statistical summaries of enrollment in the state, and it neither assisted decision-making during the admissions season nor helped planners manage the data required to predict enrollments and demand for services. Nor did the reports assist either students or secondary school counselors.

In the system described, admissions officers were occupied primarily with processing and selection work; very little admissions counseling of students took place. Some coordination of deadlines, guidelines, and secondary school visiting occurred but this was more the result of good will than the product of a clearly defined mission and organization.

The goals of the new committee and its consultant were to plan and describe the conceptual framework and components of a state-wide admissions information and processing system; to develop simplified procedures which would enable students to use a single application for applying to up to four campuses and curricula preferences; and to define a data bank that would provide reliable information for planning enrollment and curricula demands by campus and program. Also, to suggest an admissions counseling system that would, at any time of year, provide to applicants of any age and situation information about the colleges and programs that had openings; and to assist the process of self-selection of post-secondary educational opportunities by Agape's citizens. And finally, to design an application form (a common data collection form) that would be

used by all units of the University system; and to offer suggestions about how the admissions system might influence the dispersion of college students from one island or county to another. To complete these tasks, it was necessary to specify every step so that computer analysts and programmers could design the mechanics of the proposed system, connect it to the other parts of the existing Student Information System, and write the programs necessary to monitor admissions activities in all units and to generate reports.

A review of the field of computer-assisted admissions leads one to the conclusion that the Agape system makes unique use of computer-generated reports and mass media for admissions planning, counseling, and processes. It also makes use of the proximity of students to campuses for orientation counseling and registration in the entire system.

In order to design the system and recommend procedures, one had to consider what information would be processed, and this meant that the basic philosophy of the proposed system had to be articulated so that one could know what information was required.¹⁶ For example, open admissions had no consistent definition. One had to be conceived and approved that would state who was eligible: any high school graduate?, or any high school graduate plus other citizens of the state who were over 19 years old? What credentials should be required in an

¹⁶ A full discussion may be found in the report sponsored by the Regents of the University: Scott, Robert A. "Public Higher Education in Agape: How to Enroll; Proposals for a New System." October, 1971.

open admissions system? Would the credentials be used for selection or placement, or both? Should a high school transcript be required of applicants who had been out of school for several years? What information would be most useful to an applicant in choosing a college campus and curriculum? What would be the best way to convey to prospective students an accurate impression of campus characteristics?

The reader will see, I think, how the answers to these and related questions would affect the information needs of a system: how the information should be requested, how it should be processed, and how it should be presented. The answers to these questions and the following guidelines became the conceptual building blocks for the new system.

Guidelines

1. The system should facilitate the matching of student aspirations with the on- and off-campus resources of the various University units.
2. The system should be humane and easy to follow. It should not depend on or operate by the secondary school schedule; it should recognize that many potential students do not maintain close connections with their secondary schools.
3. There should be no confusing instructions or relationships. Only when a student has not been admitted to a program will he have contact with the central Admissions Processing Center (A.P.C.) Otherwise, he will communicate with a campus unit or with his secondary school, not with off-

campus "downtown post office number."

4. The system must be swift. It must process applications quickly for the benefit of students and campus units. There should be no delays between the date of the initial filing of an application and the final admissions decision, even if a student must be considered by his third or fourth choice program.
5. The system must be informative. Timely data must be available for public knowledge, counseling students about campus openings, and research. Students should always know their status.
6. The system should influence where students apply by providing sufficient information to permit the intelligent and voluntary self-selection of programs by students.
7. If current unique programs can admit all who apply, then many applicants will be admitted to their first choice campuses. However, applicants and their parents and counselors must be educated to look at campuses other than the University at Flora. Theoretically, dispersion can take place whenever a student's curriculum choice exists on more than one campus.
8. The APC is to collect information from and coordinate the processing of admissions applications to all eight units of the University system: the six community colleges, the University at Flora, and the College at Tope. This Center, staffed by an administrator and two or three clerks, will work with the Office of the Vice President

for Academic Affairs, the Management System Office, and the campus units. The APC will require the services of the University's Management Systems Office (MSO) to develop the computer software that APC will use to build, maintain, and access its files.

9. This should be a quick and efficient system that uses only one application for up to four choices per student. Thus, students will be saved the time, anxiety, and money involved in submitting several applications to the State system. At present, students must pay a dollar or more for each secondary school transcript sent out after the first two. Also, the proposed system will reduce the number of records processed in high school counseling and college admissions offices.
10. The system should release admissions officers from time-consuming clerical chores so that they may devote more time to counseling and research.
11. The system should make it possible to reduce the clerical effort required to assemble and transmit admissions data. This should reduce the duplication of effort and the associated administrative costs of the admissions operation.
12. The system should make it easier to manage data in order to assist local and system-wide decision-making. The system should facilitate local or campus decision-making, not replace it.

13. The information files must be secure. The common practices of protection, core partitions, access codes, "need to know," etc. should be employed to protect the privacy of applicants.

To encourage and assist the intelligent self-selection of curricula and campuses by students (item number 6), colleges must provide sufficient information about their philosophies, goals, and settings. This should include any information capable of influencing student achievement and growth. (While information of this kind can be helpful for the initial selection of a campus, it does have two pitfalls: on the one hand, it can help reduce the diversity of student types on campus by "recruiting" only the type pictured; and, on the other hand, it can become out-of-date quickly as new generations of students establish their own styles or follow new fads). Such information includes administrative and educational policies and practices, physical plant and facilities, teaching practices; social ambience and degree of intellectual orientation on the campus; relationships between students and faculty; the number, percentage, and characteristics of those who drop out or transfer; costs and how they may be met; opportunities for and types of housing available; detailed local profiles based on measures such as the College Student Questionnaire (CSQ), College and University Environmental Scales (CUES), American Council on Education (ACE) questionnaire, and similar instruments; and the descriptions of goals and opportunities of academic programs.

Other helpful information would include the objectives of academic divisions on campus and the types of education offered; for example, the relative emphasis placed on general education versus professional studies, and the relative emphasis placed on supervised or structured versus more independent educational methods. Also, the percentage of part-time and commuting students; academic placement policies and opportunities, e.g., the use of College Board Advanced Placement, College Level Examination Program, transfer of college credit, etc.; the location of the campus; special travel problems; grade point average expectancy tables to help students predict the statistical probability of their achieving given grades at different campus units and in different programs; examples of the mobility of graduates to senior colleges, graduate schools, and careers.

There are several possible sources of information for self-selection by students:

1. A brochure of detailed descriptions about the diverse attributes of campus units and instructions about application procedures for all categories of students.
2. Secondary school counselors do and will play a special role in the system: they advise students about regular admission, early admission, and part-time, non-degree matriculation. Counselors must be convinced about the value of community colleges as alternatives for freshman and sophomore studies and must be informed enough to advise young people and adults about the numerous options available.

3. Special brochures produced by each campus unit.
4. Educational Television (ETV) programs about the opportunities for higher education in Agape.
5. News media stories about the opportunities and spaces available in various campus units.
6. Local campuses can serve their areas as the focal points for the entire system. In concert with the secondary schools, they can provide career and educational counseling, testing, evaluation, and recruiting for all campuses. Admissions counselors in campus units and the University's office for high school relations should have sufficient travel budgets to permit familiarity with campus units around the State. These counselors are the primary contacts between the campus units and the high schools in the state.

The promise of mobility in the system must be emphasized and understood. Everyone, students, parents, and counselors, must believe, and it must be true, that starting at a lower cost, local community college will not adversely affect one's future mobility in the system, and that personal needs will be taken into account; e.g., the possibility either of completing the transfer curriculum or of earning the Associate in Arts degree in one year. The University system should not be hierarchical with the University campus at top, but rather a system of parallel tracks with frequent cross-overs and connectors, with some tracks going farther than others.

This is an important distinction. The promise of opened admissions is that every entrant has the opportunity to progress from any starting point to the end. The system should be designed to provide the assistance needed to proceed from the most basic instruction to the most advanced, with only students' motivation and ability as restraints. A hierarchical or pyramidal system is designed with the assumption that many people will be permitted to enter at the basic levels, but that they will be weeded out to restrict the number at more advanced levels.

These considerations, and the concern for the protection of confidentiality which was observed by deciding to collect only the absolutely minimum objective information and by limiting access to it, give an overview of how the proposals both respond to specific needs and contribute to our understanding of broader issues of educational planning and administration. The proposals also demonstrate how technology, in this case the computer, can help solve human problems.¹⁷

The transition from Regent command to an operating Coordinated Admissions Program (CAP), as the new system came to be called, was not without its difficulties. This brief review of the transition covers three stages: with the consultant; between the time of the consultant and the appointment of a director of CAP; after the appointment of the director.

¹⁷ Ibid.

During the first week of this writer's four-week assignment as consultant to the President's planning group, the chairman and I divided responsibilities. He agreed to write the admissions brochure, "Public Higher Education in Agape: How to Enroll," that I proposed. I agreed to develop the common application form and the conceptual framework and components of a State-wide admissions system. This latter task involved specifying every step in the proposed system so that computer analysts and programmers could design the new system, connect it to the other parts of the existing student information system, and write the programs necessary to generate reports and monitor admissions activity in all units.

The final report evolved by drafts: each one had wide review, and progressively wider acceptance. Perhaps this acceptance was a function of the basic nature of the proposals: They fulfilled the goals of the system and, although they had unique features, they neither departed radically from accepted theory and practice nor required large amounts of money or manpower to accomplish. I studied the admissions resources and proposed additions, deletions, and changes to them in order to establish the first stage of a three-stage program that from the beginning was designed to satisfy the university system's requirements.

I talked about the project with many groups and individuals. Some of the groups included the president's central staff, the Inter-Campus Council, the Ward Faculty Senate, the Community

College Provosts, the Community College Faculty Senate chairmen, the Flora Chancellor's Committee, the Flora Committee of Academic Deans, the Educational Policy and Planning Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the President's Committee on Coordinated Admissions. Some of the individuals with whom I discussed the proposals were the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice President for Community Colleges, the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning, and the Director of Institutional Studies. Also, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Provost of Tope, the Director of Admissions, the Vice President for Business and Planning, several community college provosts, and officials of the State Education Department. During many of these talks, I was struck by the confusion and lack of information that existed about the purposes of and the relationships between the concept of coordinated admissions, the proposed information system, "quotasetting," and "growth with dispersion." These topics had become one in the minds of many who envisioned a central computer czar who would allocate students to campuses. After I clarified my ideas, I found enthusiastic supporters who agreed with my purposes and my methods. However, there still existed considerable concern about both the President's and the Presidential assistant's -- who was chairing the committee to which I was the consultant -- statements about admissions. In each instance, I suggested that the Provosts and Vice Presidents or Chancellors of the different

faculties convene their Senates and discuss the issues. I thought it was important for these groups to understand current policies, to know what questions were being considered, and to know what their role would be in the final establishment of policies.

This emphasis on consultation with the eventual users of the system cannot be understated. The campus representatives were anxious about the possible loss of autonomy as a result of the system. Community college officers, especially, were concerned that they would lose their identities and become mere satellites of the high-status Flora campus. All units expressed the fear that the new system would impose quotas and make admissions decisions for them. These concerns about power were expressed often, and I think they were real, but I also think they were exacerbated by another set of factors.

The major group in Agape politics and education are Japanese-Americans, with other Oriental ethnic groups occupying major positions of power in other activities of society. Racial and cultural tension between Asian-Americans and Caucasians from the mainland was a fact of life. "Haoles", or white foreigners, were often seen, I was told, as feeling themselves to be superior and contemptuous of Agape social customs. They also spoke of the mainland as the "'States," as if the Agape Islands were not part of the United States. This phenomenon is important to understand because most of the committee members and future users of the new admissions system were Japanese-American, and

the person designated by the President of the University (a Caucasian) to chair the committee was a haole who was thought of as arrogant and insensitive. So the consultant's job was doubly difficult: he not only had to convince people that the system would not destroy their autonomy, but he also had to find a way to have the current chairman of the committee replaced. The new chairman would have to be accepted by the native Agapes, understand admissions, and be on the faculty or staff of the system since the Governor's budget constraints would not permit the hiring of an outsider.

The period after the report was accepted and before the new director was appointed lasted only a few months, and allowed a necessary consolidation of support and acceptance of the system to occur. I had been in Agape for only one month, working six and one-half days a week, and the committee had worked hard and often. A period of reflection was needed. After the new director was appointed -- an assistant professor of education who had worked in admissions on the mainland at both a small private college and a major university -- he continued the same procedure of frequent communication and personal contact. He held workshops and started a newsletter. The latter was especially helpful during the early stages of development and built up a readership that continues to rely on it for new information, clarifications, and ideas.

The proposals of the group to which this writer was the consultant were accepted in November 1971, and became the

agenda for the small group headed by the new chairman. The Regents and legislature of the State of Agape wanted an admissions system that would provide improved guidance, operation, dispensation, and planning.¹⁸ He led the state-wide implementation effort that resulted in the forms, booklets, slide-shows, procedures, computer programs, etc., which were based on the proposals and were necessary for the operation CAP. The new system went into effect the next year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

¹⁸ Dyer, Peter T. "The Coordinated Admissions Program: A Unique Approach." College and University, pp. 112-122.